EXHIBIT 3

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

Honorable	Eugene R. Wedoff		Hearing Date	December 30,	r 30, 2005
Bankruptcy C	ase No.	02 B 48191	Adversary No.		
Title of Case	UAL Corpor	ation, et al.			
					alla mali de la
Brief Statement of Motion	Motion of PBGC for partial summary judgment				
	(Docket entry no. 13442)				
				·	
27					
Names and Addresses of	F			,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
moying counsel					
Representing					
	ORDER				
	It is hereby o	ordered that the above-stated motion,	t the above-stated motion, being treated as a motion in limine, is grante		
	stated on the	record on December 16, 2005.	····	(
	<u> </u>				
		<u> </u>	Curene	X	-Wy
			<u> </u>	1	
					
					
			// 		

```
12\_16\_05 \ \mbox{United Ownibus Hearing Transcript.txt} \\ THE \ \mbox{COURT: Well, if you can give ten days} \\ notice, you would do it electronically, pursuant to
22
23
          the case management order.

MR. LIPKE: We will.

THE COURT: I would expect that would
24
25
0074
          probably be enough. If someone opposes the
 1 2 3
         diminution of the time, I will hear the objection. But I would expect that won't be objected to and
 4
          we'll be able to go ahead.

MR. LIPKE: Under.

THE COURT: Okay.
  5
                                            Understood, Your Honor.
  6
                         MR. LIPKE: Thank you. Have a good day.
MR. CIMINO: Your Honor, can I hand these
  8
  9
          up?
                         THE COURT: If you'd like.
10
          (Document tendered.)
THE COURT: Okay. The next items on the agenda are items 22 through 24, having to do with
13
14
          the creditors committee's objection to the PBGC
15
16
17
          MR. ABBOTT: Your Honor, David Abbott from General Foods Credit Corp. I'd just like to interrupt for a moment. You had skipped item number
Ĩ8
19
20
                         THE COURT: Oh, excuse me. MR. ABBOTT: And we can certainly come back
21
22
23
24
           to it after you continue with where you are. But
          the --
                         THE COURT: Oh, I didn't skip it. That's
25
           the omnibus objection.
0075
                         MR. ABBOTT: No, the -- that was item
  1234
           number 17, the duplicative issue. General Foods
           Credit Corp. does not have that duplicative issue.
          And we're prepared to proceed on that argument.
THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'm not prepared.
  5
6
7
           We're going to continue that for status until the
           30th of December.
                         MR. ABBOTT: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Again then, items 22
  89
          through 24 dealing with the creditors committee's objection to the PBGC claim.

MR. SELIGNAN: Good morning, Your Honor.
 10
 11
12
          David Seligman on behalf of the debtors.

MR. PRINCE: Good morning, Your Honor.
Christopher Prince of Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal
 13
 14
15
16
17
18
19
           for the committee
          MR. BOYLE: Good morning, Your Honor. Jo. Boyle from Kelley Drye & Warren on behalf of PBGC.

MS. CECCOTTI: Good morning, Your Honor.
           Babette Ceccotti for the Air Line Pilots
 20
21
22
23
24
25
           Association.
           MS. HEERMANS: And, Your Honor, Nancy
Heermans and Shannon Novey here for PBGC on the
           phone.
                          THE COURT: Okay, Thank you, Ms. Heermans.
 0076
   12
                                  Anyone else want to enter an
           appearance?
                         (No response.)
THE COURT: All right. This matter, as I
           said, is before the court on the creditors committee's objection to the claim of the PBGC, but
```

Page 3

12_16_05 United Omnibus Hearing Transcript.txt

```
this claim is subject to a motion for what's called partial summary judgment. I think it's more
           properly considered as a motion in limine. There is some authority for the proposition that summary
10
11
           judgment is inappropriate unless it completely disposes of a claim, and this does not completely dispose of a claim. But, either way, as we had
12
13
14
            discussed at the last omnibus, this motion is part
15
            of an effort to potentially narrow the issues that
16
            would have to be determined at a trial. And so it
17
            is of real significance in advancing the resolution
            of the dispute and the reorganization in general.

There is a number 24, a motion of the
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
            creditors committee to exceed the page limit, and
            that will be granted.
                                      As to the motion for summary judgment,
            the PBGC seeks a determination that its claim should
            be valued according to a regulation that it has
25
            adopted for such valuation.
                                                                  The applicable
0077
           bankruptcy law is found in Section 502(b) of the Bankruptcy Code which states --
  1
2
3
           Bankruptcy Code which states -

The parties may want to sit down.

This isn't as long as some of the other ones I've had to read, but still long enough that you might be more comfortable sitting.

Section 502(b) states that claims are to be allowed, quote, "as of the date of the filing of the petition," close quote, and then quoting again, "except to the extent," close quote, that they are subject to disallowance under one of the
  6
7
  89
10
11
            they are subject to disallowance under one of the
            grounds specified in the nine paragraphs set out in Section 502\,(\text{b}) .
12
13
14
15
                                       Allowance under Section 502(b)
            necessarily involves the amount of the claim in
           addition to its validity, since many of the grounds set out in Section 502(b) deal only with the amount of the claim. For example, see Section 502(b) (4) which disallows a claim for services of an insider
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
0078
            or an attorney of the debtor to the extent that the claim exceeds the reasonable value of the services
            rendered. Thus -- or {\bf I} should say the question of payment is distinct from allowance. Allowed claims
            may be separately classified by the debtor or they may be subject to equitable subordination. But
            allowance under 502(b) is in the amount that would
  1
2
3
           be applicable under nonbankruptcy law except to the extent that one of the provisions of Section 502(b) applies. There is no general equitable power in bankruptcy courts to disallow claims since that would conflict with Section 502(b). See Raleigh
            versus Illinois Department of Revenue, 503 U.S. 15, a 2000 decision of the United States Supreme Court.
            The amount of a valid claim must therefore be determined as of the petition date
 ıŏ
            according to applicable nonbankruptcy law unless one of the grounds in the nine paragraphs of Section
11
12
            502(b) applies
13
            Now, the governing nonbankruptcy law here provides that upon an involuntary termination
14
15
            of a pension plan covered by ERISA, the sponsoring employer and each member of its control group are liable to the PECC in the amount of, quote.
16
17
```

```
12_16_05 United Omnibus Hearing Transcript.txt "unfunded benefit liabilities," close quote, 29 U.S.C. Section 1362(a) and (b).
19
20
21
                                     Under Section 1362(b)(1)(A), the
22
23
           amount of the unfunded benefit liabilities is to be, quote, "calculated from the termination date in
24
25
           accordance with regulations proscribed by the PBGC." Under Section 1301(a)(18), the, quote, "amount of
0079
           unfunded benefit liabilities," close quote, means
  123456789
           the excess of the benefit liabilities under the plan
           determined on the basis of assumptions prescribed by
           the PBGC for purposes of Section 1344 of this title
           over the current value of the assets of the plan.

The PBGC has adopted regulations under
           Section 1334 for calculating the amount of unfunded benefit liabilities, 29 CFR 4044.52 to 4044.75, and
           neither the committee nor ALPA have argued that the
           regulations are inapplicable or would not be used to determine the amount of United's unfunded benefit
10
11
           liabilities under applicable nonbankruptcy law. Thus, they are binding here in determining PBGC's
12
13
14
           claim.
           In reviewing the precedent on this question, the reasoning that I've outlined is
 15
16
           consistent with the decision in In re US Airways Group, Inc., 303 BR 784, Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, 2003. The contrary decisions in In re CF&I Fabricators of Utah, Inc., 150 F.3d 1293, 10th Circuit, 1998, and In re CSC Industries, Inc., 232 F.3d 505, Sixth Circuit, 2000, and baddings that bankruptcy courts do have
17
18
19
20
20
21
22
23
24
25
0080
           are based on holdings that bankruptcy courts do have
           an equitable power to determine the amount of claims
            in a manner different than what applicable
  1
2
           nonbankruptcy law would require. Those holdings do
           not accurately reflect the provisions of the code
           that I outlined earlier and so cannot be followed.
On that basis then, the PBGC's motion,
  3
            treated as a motion in limine, would be granted.
  67
           And we need to discuss what remaining steps should take place to determine the amount of that claim,
  8
            including the need to determine the claim as of the
           petition date
10
                            MR. SELICMAN: Your Honor, if I could
           perhaps just make a suggestion on behalf of the debtors? Obviously this narrows the issues. I
 11
 12
 13
            think we had said before that we thought that the
14
15
            relative -- you know, the relevant actuaries with
           this ruling could probably get together and figure out the amounts. So I would suggest that perhaps we continue this for a short period of time. I don't
 16
17
            even think next -- maybe we can do it in two weeks
 18
           even think next -- maybe we can do it in two weeks when there is going to be already the hearing on -- THE COURT: Well, I was going to say as long as the parties are going -- some of the parties are going to be present on the 30th. If that works, I would be happy to have you come in on the 30th and tell me where things stand.

MR. PRINCE: Your Honor, I think you've
 19
20
21
22
23
24
25
0081
           properly characterized it as a motion in limine. And in that connection, I\,{}^{'}m not sure that it narrows the issues as much as is presented. And this was an issue raised in our opposition, the 1362\,(b)\,(2)\,(B)\,,
```